



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

KAARDAL & ASSOCIATES PC  
ATTN IVAR M KAARDAL  
3500 SOUTH FIRST AVENUE CIRCLE  
SUITE 250  
SIOUX FALLS, SD 57105-5807

MAILED

DEC 08 2011

In re Patent No. 6,493,891  
Issue Date: December 17, 2002  
Application No.: 09/666,921  
Filed: September 21, 2000  
Attorney Docket No.: 99-1326

: OFFICE OF PETITIONS  
:  
: DECISION ON PETITION  
: UNDER 37 CFR 1.378(b)  
:

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b), filed November 1, 2011, to accept an unavoidably delayed payment of a maintenance fee for the above-identified patent.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

If reconsideration of this decision is desired, a petition for reconsideration under 37 CFR 1.378(e) must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. No extension of this 2-month time limit can be granted under 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b). **Any such petition for reconsideration must be accompanied by the petition fee of \$400 as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(f).** The petition for reconsideration should include an exhaustive attempt to provide the lacking item(s) noted below, since, after a decision on the petition for reconsideration, no further reconsideration or review of the matter will be undertaken by the Director.

The patent issued on December 17, 2002. The first maintenance fee could have been paid from December 17, 2005, through June 19, 2006, or with a surcharge during the period from June 20, 2006 through December 17, 2006. Accordingly, the patent expired at midnight December 17, 2006, for failure to timely submit the first maintenance fee.

A petition to accept the delayed payment of a maintenance fee under 35 U.S.C. § 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b) must be accompanied by (1) an adequate showing that the delay was unavoidable, since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent, (2) payment of the appropriate maintenance fee, unless previously submitted, and (3) payment of the surcharge set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(i)(1).

The petition lacks item (1) above.

The Director may accept late payment of the maintenance fee if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been "unavoidable". 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1).

Petitioner states that the delay in payment of the maintenance fees was unavoidable because "I would have submitted the maintenance fee if I had known the amount and I still don't know what I should have paid on the three payment dates."

The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3). Petitioner should note that a delay resulting from the lack of knowledge of the need to pay maintenance fees does not excuse the delay. See Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (Comm'r Pat. 1988), *aff'd*, Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 F. Supp. 900, 16 USPQ2d 1876 (D.D.C. 1990), *aff'd*, 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991)(table), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 1075 (1992).

Acceptance of late payment of a maintenance fee is considered under the same standard as that for reviving an abandoned application under 35 U.S.C. § 133 because 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1) uses the identical language, i.e. "unavoidable delay". Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 608-09, 34 USPQ2d 1786, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1995)(quoting In re Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (Comm'r Pat. 1988)). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the "reasonably prudent person" standard in determining if the delay in responding to an Office action was unavoidable. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887)(the term "unavoidable" "is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business"); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-515 (D.C. Cir. 1912); and Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141. In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay. Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

In essence, petitioner must show that patentee was aware of the need to pay the maintenance fee, and to that end was tracking it, or had engaged someone to track it before the expiration, but when the fee came due, was "unavoidably" prevented from making the maintenance fee payment until the petition was filed.

In determining whether a delay in paying a maintenance fee was unavoidable, one looks to whether the party responsible for payment of the maintenance fee exercised the due care of a reasonably prudent person. Ray, 55 F3d at 608-609, 34 USPQ2D at 1787. It is incumbent upon the patent owner to implement steps to schedule and pay the fee, or obligate another to do so. See California Medical Products v. Technol. Med. Prod., 921 F.Supp 1219, 1259 (D. Del. 1995). That is, 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) requires a showing of the steps in place to pay the maintenance fee, and the record currently lacks a showing that any steps were in place by petitioner or anyone else.

The record fails to disclose that the patentee took reasonable steps to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. In fact, the record indicates that no steps were taken by patentee to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. Since no steps were taken by patentee, 37 CFR 1.378(b) precludes acceptance of the delayed payment of the maintenance fee. In the absence of a showing that petitioner or anyone else was engaged in tracking the maintenance fee due dates, and that party had in fact been tracking the due dates with a reliable tracking system, such as would be used by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business, petitioner cannot reasonably show that the delay was unavoidable delay. In re Katrapat, 6 USPQ2d 1863, 1867-1868 (Comm'r Pat. 1988); California, supra.

35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1) does not require an affirmative finding that the delay was avoidable, but only an explanation as to why the petitioner has failed to carry his or her burden to establish that the delay was unavoidable. See Commissariat A. L'Energie Atomique v. Watson, 274 F.2d 594, 597, 124 USPQ 126, 128 (D.C. Cir. 1960)(35 U.S.C. § 133 does not require the Director to affirmatively find that the delay was avoidable, but only to explain why the applicant's petition was unavailing). Petitioner is reminded that it is the patentee's burden under the statutes and regulations to make a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in payment of a maintenance fee is unavoidable. See Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 F. Supp. 900, 16 USPQ2d 1876 (D.D.C. 1990), aff'd 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991)(table), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1075 (1992); Ray v. Lehman, supra.

As 35 USC § 41(b) requires the payment of fees at specified intervals to maintain a patent in force, rather than some response to a specific action by the Office under 35 USC § 133, a reasonably prudent person in the exercise of due care and diligence would have taken steps to ensure the timely payment of such maintenance fees. Ray, 55 F.3d at 609, 34 USPQ2d at 1788. That is, an adequate showing that the delay in payment of the maintenance fee at issue was "unavoidable" within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) requires a showing of the steps taken by the responsible party to ensure the timely payment of the first maintenance fee for this patent. Id.

As the patentee at the time of expiration, it was incumbent on petitioner to have this patent docketed for payment of the maintenance fee in a reliable system as would be employed by a prudent and careful person with respect to his most important business, or to have engaged another for that purpose. See California Medical Products v. Technol Med. Prod., 921 F.Supp. 1219, 1259 (D.Del. 1995).

Since petitioner has not shown to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in paying the maintenance fee was unavoidable, the petition cannot be granted at this time.

Petitioner should note that if this petition is not renewed or if renewed and not granted, then the maintenance fee and post expiration surcharge are refundable. See 37 CFR 1.378(e) and such may be obtained by written request from the Office of Finance, Refund Section, at the USPTO address above.

Lastly, it is noted that the petition is signed by the inventor, Lucy J. Livingston; however, petitioner has appointed a representative to conduct all business before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Office). The Office does not engage in dual correspondence with petitioner and petitioner's representative. If petitioner no longer wishes to be represented by the representative of record, then a revocation of the power of attorney or patent agent should be submitted. Petitioner is advised that the mere filing of a power of attorney and/or a change of correspondence address will not affect the fee address. Therefore, if the patent is reinstated and petitioner desires to receive future correspondence regarding any Maintenance Fee Reminder which may be mailed regarding maintenance fees for the above-identified patent, a "Fee Address" Indication Form (see PTO/SB/47) and Request for Customer Number (see PTO/SB/125) must also be submitted. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the petitioner herein; however, all future correspondence regarding this patent will be directed solely to the above-noted correspondence address of record.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be delivered through one of the following mediums:

By mail:                      Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    Post Office Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                     Customer Service Window  
                                    Mail Stop Petitions  
                                    Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax:                        (571) 273-8300  
                                    ATTN: Office of Petitions

By internet:                EFS-Web<sup>1</sup>

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204.

/SDB/  
Sherry D. Brinkley  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions

cc:     LUCY LIVINGSTON  
         1608 DAY STAR DR.  
         DALLAS, TX 75224

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.uspto.gov/ebc/efs\\_help.html](http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/efs_help.html) (for help using EFS-Web call the Patent Electronic Business Center at (866) 217-9197)